

I can empathize with the position the FCC is in with regards to this issue. Having sold equipment to Internet Service Providers that was used to provide Internet Telephony, I can understand that as the technology moves forward, so must the laws that regulate the industry that provides such services for the consumer market.

By that same token, I would ask that the FCC consider a couple of items. First, Telephony companies are moving away from the original dial model of the "big iron" switches to a more distributed architecture. This means that any equipment used to monitor Internet calls would require much more equipment be purchased for those distributed sites. This will have the obvious impact on their pricing models. Second, this new gear will require the retraining of employees. Aside from the obvious impact to pricing, the simple fact is that ISP's do not have the staffing necessary to support their current infrastructure, much less the expanded team needed for new monitoring gear.

Before this burden is placed upon those companies, that provide Internet connectivity to the consumer market, I would ask if the level of crime in this country warrants such a burden. On the face of it, this question would appear naive. However, since the spirit of our laws say that a person is innocent until proven guilty, what is the justification to say that all Internet Telephony must be ready to provide a feature for listening in? Yes, crimes can occur at any time and at any place. And government (the DoJ and FCC in this case) must have the tools needed to combat that crime. But to capture a copy of phone calls because they "might" have evidence in them, goes against the principles of self-incrimination. Is this new feature meant as a deterrent?

Thank you for your time.